

# THE PAST AND THE FUTURE OF ETHNOGRAPHY

PATRICIA A. ADLER  
PETER ADLER

WITH THIS, the third name change of this journal in its fifteen-year history, we hope to finally emphasize the original "mission" set forth by its founding editor, John Lofland, and his editorial board. As the first journal in sociology dedicated to ethnography, and qualitative research more generally, the purpose of *Urban Life and Culture* (later *Urban Life*), was to advance sociological knowledge through intensive, in-depth studies of human behavior in natural settings. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* (*JCE*) will continue this tradition, and hopefully advance it, incorporating other social science disciplines where the craft/art/science of ethnography is currently practiced. In the following article we will, in part, describe our plans and hopes for the future of the journal, while considering its place in the past, present, and future of the social sciences.

## EDITORIAL POLICY

Our decision to change the journal's title was not lightly undertaken, for *Urban Life* has an established reputation both within and beyond sociology, and is associated with a special history and tradition. Although the publisher, Sage, responded eagerly to our suggestion, many qualitative sociologists were less enthralled, having become attached

---

*AUTHORS' NOTE:* We would like to thank Bob Canfield, Michael Orbach, and especially Murray Wax for their gracious support and advice.

JOURNAL OF CONTEMPORARY ETHNOGRAPHY, Vol. 16 No. 1, April 1987 4-24  
© 1987 Sage Publications, Inc.

to the familiarity of the old title, feeling detached from the "scientistic" sound of the new one, and concerned that their articles originally published in *Urban Life* would become lost in the process. Others embraced the name and its purpose. The primary reason for the name change was to eliminate an obvious misnomer. For instance, in reflecting on his tenure as New Ethnographies editor, John Johnson (personal communication) commented on the frequency with which publishers sent him books to review on urban studies. From our perspective, *Urban Life* published ethnographies of contemporary urban societies that dealt with a broad variety of subject matter. The focus was not on *urban*, but on a distinctive way of studying social phenomena. It was this focus that we wanted the new name to reflect. With the title clearly emphasizing ethnography, it is our intent to expand the journal's reach interdisciplinarily into anthropology, education, management, and communication (and to a lesser extent, humanistic psychology and political science) while still retaining a base in sociology. Toward achieving this end, we have appointed deputy editors in several of these fields. We look to these people to help *JCE* become more established in their disciplines by encouraging solicitations, contributing to the review process, and having them serve as visible symbols of this editorial policy. Our vision thus is one of integration between ethnographers separated by theoretical, disciplinary, national, and substantive boundaries. Although the pages of this journal may thus be slightly altered from the past, the link with depth, descriptive portrayals, and analyses of social life will continue.

In large part our remaining editorial philosophy represents a firm continuity with the traditions of the past. Following Emerson's (1984) thrust, we want to encourage the *empirical* focus on rich, textured, ethnographic data. Researchers who offer dense and "thick" (Geertz, 1973) description provide a picture that represents the members'

perspectives on the structure, experiences, and meanings of their social worlds.

Like Manning (1978), we also want to emphasize the importance of the *conceptual* dimension of ethnography. Micro sociology, especially ethnography, has too often been guilty of the charge that it is endlessly descriptive and particularistic. We urge our authors and reviewers to transcend "Boazian description" and search for the fullest generic implications of the work they write and read. By looking for the transsituational relevance of ethnographic descriptions, we can generate, modify, and expand the conceptualizations that shape our scientific understanding.

We further encourage authors to look for the broader *theoretical* relevance of their analytical concepts. Gary Fine (personal communication) suggests that ethnography devoted primarily to theoretical analysis represents part of a new American tradition of qualitative research. Ethnography can fruitfully contribute to the full and eclectic variety or combination of everyday life microsociological perspectives. This journal should not be seen as the exclusive domain of one theoretical approach; rather, it addresses symbolic interactionism, dramaturgy, labeling, phenomenology, existential sociology, and ethnomethodology. As such, we welcome studies of social scenes, social worlds, social institutions, social existence, social order, social structure, the self, interaction in context, and language in use that both draw on and contribute to the theoretical understanding of human nature, behavior, organization, society, and culture.

If *JCE* represents a diverse everyday life theoretical base, it is more centralized in its methodology. *Epistemological* issues are the heart of ethnography. Ethnographic methods such as participant-observation and intensive depth interviewing are still fairly new, personalistic, and in need of greater exploration, discussion, and conceptual advance. We recommend that the methods sections of all ethnographies be personal and reflexive, discussing the role, loca-

tion, and feelings of the researcher(s). Only in this way can fieldworkers show readers how they managed to get close to and maintain the integrity of the phenomena they study. In addition, we welcome epistemological pieces that contribute to conceptual thinking about ethnographic methods. *JCE* has a long and valuable history of providing such a focus and forum.

Last, we would like to continue the policy, begun by Lofland and furthered by Irwin (1975), of devoting special issues of the journal to particular conceptual, substantive, or methodological themes. As a quarterly journal we have ample opportunity to focus one issue annually around a special topic.<sup>1</sup>

## ETHNOGRAPHY'S PAST

The history of ethnography is both interdisciplinary and multifaceted. Arising out of sociology and anthropology, it has seen the development of a range of interests, modes, and orientations.

One of the most critical debates involves the balance between subjectivity and objectivity, or more generally, between involvement and detachment. The origin of systematic field research occurred against a background of objectivity and detachment. The social sciences were primarily theoretical (detached), and where they had made empirical inroads, these were either quantitative (experimental, statistical) or religious (missionary) in nature. This made the methodology seemingly external to the research subjects (see Wax, 1971).

In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, some researchers began venturing into the field and gathering data personally. In anthropology, Boas initiated visits to field sites for the collection of natural language texts, surveying a broad area by spending about a week in each location. Although he did not live among his subjects or learn their language, he advocated these practices for his students

(Rohner, 1966; Wax, 1971). Malinowski originated the contemporary anthropological practice of making extended visits to single research sites. He lived in native villages and spoke their dialects, although he did so in the manner of a petty European lord descending into their midst. Despite his residential location and use of native language he did little to achieve parity, to participate in his subjects' activities, or to explore their subjective perspectives (Wax, 1972).

Sociological fieldwork roots can be traced back to the British social reform movement. Booth's study of the social conditions of the urban poor drew on a combination of statistical data, direct observation, and extensive interviewing. In gathering his data, Booth roomed for extended periods in the lodging houses of his subjects (Emerson, 1983; Keating, 1976). Beatrice Potter Webb and her husband Sidney also wrote on the living and working conditions of the poor of London, making frequent forays into the everyday lives of the working class. Although they did not reside with them, Beatrice Webb took employment in a sweatshop to experience the conditions firsthand (Bulmer, 1984; Emerson, 1983). In the United States, W.E.B. DuBois—under the sponsorship of the University of Pennsylvania, where he was an assistant professor of sociology—did fieldwork in the black slums of Philadelphia in the late 1890s. His fieldwork consisted of living with his new bride in the heart of the slum, although he utilized structured interview schedules for collecting data. The outcome of this work was the monograph, *The Philadelphia Slum* (1899). These early fieldworkers, then, did not practice ethnography as we conceive it today. Although they ventured into the field, their involvement and parity with their subjects was limited and they only scratched the surface of the members' perspective.

The flowering of fieldwork in the 1920s and 1930s was accompanied by the first real introduction of and explorations into subjectivity and involvement. Sociologists at the University of Chicago sought to plumb the experiences,

outlooks, and social worlds of members under the inspiration of Thomas and Znaniecki and the guidance of Park and Burgess. The life history, or case study, approach was the primary means they used to strive for empathy and an imaginative participation in the lives of others. This included a mixture of methods such as formal or depth interviews, informal interviews, casual conversation, observation, the collection of documentary evidence, and some naturalistic "hanging out" and interaction (Bulmer, 1984; Burgess, 1927). Considerable debate exists among sociologists as to whether this methodology can truly be called participant-observation, whether it was just a precursor, or if it was focused on something else (Platt, 1981, 1983). Although it differed in character from later participant-observation, it must be regarded as a developmental stage in the evolution of ethnography (see Adler and Adler, forthcoming).

During the same era, however, anthropologists were making far greater strides in forging their contemporary version of ethnography. Students of Boas and Malinowski went out into the field to study a variety of cultures by residing among the natives, speaking their language, and remaining less aloof. Malinowski's students followed his immersion-detachment-immersion dictum of spending a year or more in the field, withdrawing for some months and returning for another extended period, whereas Boas's had no such formula, but they all established long-term relationships with a single group of primitive people. In fact, this was the period in anthropology during which the movement to discover and document the cultures of isolated tribes before they were transformed or destroyed by the onset of Western technological culture first originated and flourished (Harris, 1968).

These early explorations into subjectivity gave way to a balancing between subjectivity and objectivity in the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s. In sociology, a new generation of fieldworkers emerged, centered, once again, around the sociology department at the University of Chicago (Adler

and Adler, 1987; Emerson, 1983; Platt, 1983). Faculty members such as Blumer, Hughes, Warner, Redfield, Strauss, and Riesman, influenced by the anthropological model of research (sociology and anthropology were a unified department at Chicago for part of this time), created an atmosphere that fostered many now classical field studies (see Becker, et al., 1961; Becker, 1963; Davis, 1963; Gusfield, 1963; Goffman, 1959; Habenstein, 1954; Roth, 1963; Warner and Lunt, 1941, 1942, and a spate of doctoral and master's theses too numerous to mention). Most significant, this was an era in which sociologists became reflective about their methodology, leading to the refinement and codification of participant-observation. Not only did their monographs begin to carry the now standard methods appendices or chapters, but a variety of articles, then monographs, and finally sets of readings appeared that explicitly discussed the principles, practices, and problems of participant-observation (see Adams and Preiss, 1960; Becker, 1967; Becker and Geer, 1960; Filstead, 1970; Gold, 1958; Habenstein, 1970; Junker, 1960; McCall and Simmons, 1969; Miller, 1952; Schwartz and Schwartz, 1955; Vidich, 1955; Webb, 1966). Although the participant-observation technique comprised a variety of roles having different degrees of involvement with the research subjects, these all balanced the pulls of objectivity and subjectivity. Ideally, ethnographers were to get close to members, participate in some of their activities, gain their trust and confidence, and discover their subjective perspectives and interpretations. At the same time, they were to keep themselves firmly anchored in the scientific conceptual framework so that they could analyze the observations and accounts they were gathering from a detached, objective vantage. In effect, they were to strive for marginal roles in their field settings (Freilich, 1970), poised between familiarity and strangeness (Everhart, 1977; Powdermaker, 1966). This balancing act was due in part to the pervasive influence of

positivistic criteria, such that field researchers sought to enhance the validity and reliability of their techniques (see Goodenough, 1964; Kirk and Miller, 1986).

Within anthropology, a much broader range of data gathering has been defined as falling within the domain of ethnography. At one end of the spectrum, allied most closely with the Chicago School in their balancing of subjectivity and objectivity and their use of unstructured depth interviewing and participant-observation, are the immersion fieldworkers. These researchers balance the involvement of the friendly visitor with the detachment of the foreigner in their interpretive analyses of native cultures (see Rosaldo, 1980; Turner, 1985), self-consciously reflecting on their research roles and experiences (although, somewhat ironically, anthropologists became reflexive about their methodology a decade or more after sociologists<sup>2</sup>). Epistemologically, this group's philosophy is best expressed by Geertz (1973) and Wax (1971).

Moving toward objectivity, another group of anthropologists employ a fairly structured and formalistic approach. This group, in an attempt to be more scientific, advocate importing strict controls into the fieldwork process and are more likely to employ a mixture of qualitative and quantitative approaches. Techniques used include kinship analysis, the construction of layered taxonomies, and collection of census data through structured and unstructured, but fairly open-ended, interviews (see Naroll, 1962, 1970; Pelto and Pelto, 1973; Spradley, 1979, 1980).

The most extreme objectivists among the anthropological ethnographers are the ethnoscientists. They use highly formalized "elicitation frames" and "systematic fieldwork" (Werner, 1966, 1983; Werner and Schoepfle, 1986a, 1986b) in order to establish precise linguistic boundaries. (These parallel, draw on, and have inspired the sociolinguistic movement predominant in ethnomethodological sociology circles.) In so doing, they narrow their focus and concentrate on denotative meanings. Their semi-structured interviews

elicit taxonomies (Frake, 1964; Metzger and Williams, 1966), componential analyses (Goodenough, 1956), folk definitions (Keen, 1985; Manes, 1976), and other cultural dimensions (see also Casagrande and Hale, 1967; Lounsbury, 1956).

Within sociology, the development of ideas among the everyday-life sociologies—which burgeoned in California during the late 1960s, the 1970s, and the 1980s—had the next profound effect on ethnographic epistemology. Although the classic Chicago School approach of marginal participant-observation continues to exist, a more radical move toward subjectivity was introduced.

Existential sociologists urged ethnographers to supplement the observations and accounts of members with the feelings and experiences they themselves accumulated in the field. Instead of remaining detached, they advocated that researchers get as close to the phenomenon as possible, especially since people put up false fronts to hide their activities and feelings. Scientific analysis does not require objective detachment, they argue, but occurs within the theoretical self-reflection of the trained social scientist (Adler and Adler, forthcoming; Douglas, 1976; Douglas and Johnson, 1977; Johnson, 1975).

Early ethnomethodologists took an even more extreme subjectivist position, arguing that the social scientist's second-or third-order interpretations of the members' worlds constitute unacceptably removed analyses. In order to attain the true members' (*emic*) perspective, researchers must "become the phenomenon" they are studying and then reflect on their own experiences (Garfinkel, 1967; Jules-Rosette, 1975; Mehan and Wood, 1975). This stance parallels the radical hermeneutical branch of anthropologists who also focus on studying themselves in their settings, from their feelings to their experiences and their relations with informants (Crapanzano, 1970, 1980, 1985; Dumont, 1978; Rabinow, 1977).

Within sociology, these subjective movements have not replaced the more balanced epistemology as the dominant mainstream in participant-observation. By advancing the frontiers of subjectivity, however, they have pulled the more classical approach in that direction. Many people now acknowledge that the goal of not influencing the setting is ideal rather than real, and should be modified to a relativistic scale (Jarvie, 1969). Moreover, the test of validity has come to rely less on objectivity and more on the researcher's closeness to the data (Manning, 1982). It is now convention among sociological ethnographers to include personal reflections on the researchers' roles and relationships in order to demonstrate their degree of involvement with the setting and its members.

In reflecting on this sociological swing toward involvement and subjectivity,<sup>3</sup> two conflicting (although possibly coexistent) thoughts arise. On the one hand, it is not surprising to see contemporary ethnographers embracing a more subjectivist stance since earlier practitioners grew out of an objectivist base and modeled themselves somewhat, even in their divergence, on their hypothetico-deductive ancestry. Our development would therefore be one of progressive liberation from these early fetters. On the other hand, qualitative epistemology is as subject to the whims of fad and fashion as any other part of science, and subjectivity may be just the latest such trend, replacing earlier objectivist leanings. In that case, the methodological descriptions we currently see may be less indicative of a general change in practice than a change in the norms of portraying involvement.

Other trends and modes in the history of ethnography do not display such an overarching pattern. Substantively, we have seen an early interest in the case studies of the 1920s and 1930s give way to community studies in the 1940s. Under Hughes, an interest in occupational studies also blossomed in the postwar decades of the 1940s, 1950s, and

1960s. This was accompanied by a focus on deviant groups in the 1960s and 1970s. The 1970s and 1980s then saw a rising interest in organizational studies. Of course, throughout this entire period a plethora of diverse topics and arenas have also been addressed (see Lofland and Lofland, 1984, for a discussion of the varieties of social scenes that have come under the scrutiny of the ethnographer's eye).

Methodologically, we have seen the rise of three "associative" modes of ethnography. By far the most predominant is the classic "Lone Ranger" approach. Both anthropology and sociology adhere to the American individualistic ethos and emphasize the import of the scholar's own, original contribution. Most of the past and present ethnographic data is thus gathered and analyzed by the single individual working alone. Second in frequency is the partnership mode (see Fujisaka and Grazel, 1978), in which two people collaborate on a project. Many partnerships—particularly in anthropology, where the necessity of relocating to a distant culture leads to the transplantation of the entire family—have been conducted by married couples. The husband and wife can thus function to bolster each other in a foreign environment and to assist each other in collaborative research.<sup>4</sup> The third mode is the team of field researchers (see Douglas, 1976) who bring their combined efforts to bear on settings that might be too large or too time-consuming for individuals to approach alone. Teams have the advantage of obtaining a multiperspectival view of the setting by employing a variety of diverse roles, but organizational and personnel problems make this a more difficult endeavor. Team field research is more often conducted in the United States because of the logistical difficulties associated with transporting a team abroad.

## **CONTEMPORARY ETHNOGRAPHY**

Ethnography today rests upon a firm base, strengthened by the explorations and advances of its early practitioners.

At its keystone is the spate of recent work focusing directly on it as a method of data collection and analysis. Since the mid-1970s we have witnessed the publication of numerous textbooks and anthologies devoted to ethnographic methods (Bogdan and Taylor, 1975; Burgess, 1982, 1983; Douglas, 1976; Emerson, 1983; Hammersley and Atkinson, 1983; Johnson, 1975; Lofland and Lofland, 1984; Schwartz and Jacobs, 1979; Shaffir, et al., 1980; Silverman, 1985; Van Maanen, 1983). A series of short books addressing qualitative methods has also been created, the mission of which is to expand the boundaries of methodological discourse by focusing in depth on specific conceptual themes (Agar, 1986; Fielding and Fielding, 1986; Kirk and Miller, 1986; Punch, 1986). There have been a number of ethnographic monograph series, produced primarily by social science publishers (the most famous of these was the one published by Aldine and edited by Howard Becker in the 1960s; followed by Sage's series in the 1970s and 1980s, edited by John Johnson; and most recently JAI has begun a series of empirical works edited by Jay Gubrium, and an annual methods review edited by Robert Burgess). Many university presses have been particularly receptive to ethnographic studies since the genre readily adapts itself to accessible yet scholarly monographs that address current social issues (most notable are the University of Chicago Press, Temple University Press, Rutgers University Press, Columbia University Press, and the University of California Press). Outlets for publishing article-length ethnographies have mushroomed, too, even though it is often difficult to present richly textured data within the limited space of the standard journal article. Thus when *Urban Life and Culture* was first founded in 1971, it was the only sociological outlet designated exclusively for qualitative work. Now, however, there are five such outlets: *JCE*, *Symbolic Interaction*, *Qualitative Sociology*, *Human Studies*, and *Humanity and Society* (see Spector and Faulkner, 1980, for a review of each of these outlets and their contribution to sociology). Ethnographic

research has also gained increasing acceptance in some of the substantive and generalist journals (see, especially, *Sociology of Education*, which, in 1984, devoted an entire issue to ethnographic work, *Social Problems*, which has a long history of publishing ethnographically based research, and *The Sociological Quarterly*, which regularly reflects its midwestern, symbolic interactionist roots).

In citing this proliferation of ethnographic and qualitative work, we do not mean to imply that the mainstream and power within the discipline has shifted. Ethnography has a niche as an accepted alternative to the dominant methodology in sociology, and it has neither gained nor lost ground in recent years. Rather, these outlets speak to ethnography's promise and potential. Many people, in all venues of social science, who study various dimensions of American life have come to the realization that hands-on observational research is vital. In reviewing the last 50 years of sociology, Homans (1986) emphasized the importance of ethnography. He suggested that an intuitive familiarity with the facts, which can only be acquired by watching, talking to, and interacting with people firsthand, provides the fundamental base of all sociological understanding. Field studies of small groups, he argued, offer us the best insight into the fundamental principles of human behavior (pp. xiv-xvi).

Yet Homans asserted that the great promise and potential of ethnography, visible in the early studies of the 1940s, has not been realized. Contemporary ethnography has not shown the kinds of advances over its early ancestry that we have seen in the quantitative realm (1986: xv-xvi).

Although we agree with the major thrust of Homans' point, we do think that contemporary ethnography has both progressed and made a major mark on the landscape of American sociology. Like the other branches of the discipline, ethnography has neither solved society's social problems nor offered us a comprehensive theoretical and

empirical model of society. It has made some valuable recent contributions, however. It has offered us “thick description” of numerous social arenas, of the impact of grand social forces on the everyday level, of the processual unfolding of events over time, and of the way social actors impute meanings and negotiate social structure within the situated complexity of their natural settings (see Adler and Adler, forthcoming, for a fuller treatment of several important ethnographic works produced in the 1980s). Ethnography’s great power lies in its depth penetration of a topic or area: it yields explanatory insights into the reasons why people, groups, and organizations act as they do, and how conflicting social forces are resolved. In so doing, it brings these to the reader with a vividness otherwise unattainable. It is no surprise, then, that the books that students overwhelmingly remember, that touch closest to their emotional chords, are usually ethnographies (in earlier decades, *Tally's Corner* and *Street Corner Society*; these are now being replaced with more contemporary, but similarly vivid depictions of American social life). Moreover, contemporary ethnography has made significant advances in its own frontiers, by reflecting on its methods, integrating other methods with its own, exploring further the objective/subjective dichotomy, working to advance validity and reliability, and adding to both our conceptual understanding of everyday life and our theoretical understanding of society.

## THE FUTURE OF ETHNOGRAPHY

Ethnography is at a critical point, and its future hangs in the balance. If ethnographers continue their rich tradition of providing depth analyses of social worlds from the members’ perspectives, they will still represent a viable and important mode of social scientific inquiry. They might continue to enjoy their modest but respected position in

academe and continue to influence and affect future generations of students. This maintenance of the status quo, though, could gradually bring about the serious decline of ethnography for several reasons. First, the trends in social science are clearly directed toward the more quantifiable and "hard" types of methodologies, with granting agencies becoming even more pedestrian in their funding avenues. The rise of these trends pushes ethnographic research into a less prominent position. Second, perilously few sociology graduate programs of national repute currently train students in ethnography or have any critical mass of qualitative sociologists on their faculty. Finally, with academic deans paying more attention to the dollar and less to scholarship, ethnographic research, in the worst scenario, could be headed for a moribund future.

Obviously, these structural features are difficult to overcome. For ethnography to thrive, however, we need to improve it continually, to push ourselves and our frontiers. As ethnographers, we are the research instrument. We acquire more sensitivity and skill each time we delve into another setting. Each research therefore builds on one additional set of experiences and improves on the last. As Van Mannen (1984) has convincingly argued, too often ethnography has been the domain of only the young and the novitiate. Only a handful of ethnographers have been able to make the leap to a second, and even third, depth study of a social world. To continue to refine methodology we need to use our acquired knowledge and experiences further.

To those who have spent time in the field, reap the pleasures again; for those on their first journey, use your self, reflect on your past, and continue to involve yourself in your present. That is how field research and ethnography is going to improve.

Ethnography is also isolated, both within sociology and as a methodology of the social sciences. Pockets of practitioners exist in different fields, but their communica-

tion is sporadic, their terminology varied, and their insights incompletely shared. It must be the mission of a journal of this kind to bridge these gaps, to define ethnography as broadly as possible in both disciplinary and interdisciplinary terms. In this way we can more broadly tap the keen observational and interpretive sociological optic of those people who have been rigorously trained to do ethnographic research. We pledge, then, to guide *JCE* as an ecumenical journal whose primary goal is to promote the theoretical, conceptual, epistemological, and methodological goals of ethnography.

In the remainder of this special issue all of the former editors—John Lofland, John Irwin, Peter Manning, and Robert Emerson—offer their particular remembrances of the past and their ideas for the future. In keeping with the theme of self-reflection, we have invited each of them to write an essay discussing their experiences as editors. Specifically, we asked them to reflect on how they saw the state of ethnography during their tenure, what kinds of problems, challenges, and gratifications they faced as editors, and how they perceive the situation then and now.

## NOTES

1. Our first special issue, guest edited by Ralph LaRossa, will address qualitative family research.

2. It is now widely acknowledged that until the 1960s, methodology within anthropology was an underdeveloped, non-reflexive area, following a "conspiracy of silence" (Berreman, 1962; Cohen and Naroll, 1970; Diamond, 1980; Ellen, 1984; Scholte, 1980). As a result, each generation of anthropologists had to relearn the experiences of the previous one and there was little accumulation of methodological knowledge (Cohen and Naroll, 1970).

3. It is somewhat ironic that some anthropologists have been involved in a corresponding recent trend toward quantification (Agar, 1980). Many anthropologists now regard their discipline as the one most likely to ethnographically bridge the qualitative-quantitative realm (Ellen, 1984).

4. See, however, Bateson (1984), who draws upon her childhood as the daughter of Gregory Bateson and Margaret Mead, for a personal account of how

debilitating field research in foreign cultures can be on family life. For alternative, and largely more positive, accounts of children's experiences in the field, see Casell (1987).

## REFERENCES

ADAMS, R. N. and J. J. PREISS [eds.] (1960) *Human Organization Research*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.

ADLER, P. and P. A. ADLER (forthcoming) *Membership Roles in Field Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

AGAR, M. (1980) *The Professional Stranger*. New York: Academic Press.

AGAR, M. (1986) *Speaking of Ethnography*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

BATESON, M. C. (1984) *With a Daughter's Eye*. New York: Washington Square Press.

BECKER, H. S. (1963) *Outsiders*. New York: Free Press.

BECKER, H. S. (1967) "Whose side are we on?" *Social Problems* 14: 239-247.

BECKER, H. S. and B. GEER (1960) "Participant observation: the analysis of qualitative field data," pp. 267-289 in R. N. Adams and J. J. Preiss (eds.) *Human Organization Research*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.

BECKER, H. S., B. GEER, E. HUGHES, and A. STRAUSS (1961) *Boys in White*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

BERREMAN, G. D. (1962) *Behind Many Masks: Ethnography and Impression Management in a Himalayan Hill Village*. Ithaca, NY: Society for Applied Anthropology.

BOGDAN, R. and S. J. TAYLOR (1975) *Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods*. New York: John Wiley.

BULMER, M. (1984) *The Chicago School of Sociology*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

BURGESS, E. W. (1927) "Statistics and case studies as methods of sociological research." *Sociology and Social Research* 12: 103-120.

BURGESS, R. G. (1982) "Some role problems in field research," pp. 45-49 in R. G. Burgess (ed.) *Field Research: A Sourcebook and Field Manual*. London: Allen & Unwin.

BURGESS, R. G. (1983) *In the Field*. London: Allen & Unwin.

CASAGRANDE, J. B. and K. L. HALE (1967) "Semantic relations in Papago folk definitions," pp. 81-105 in D. Hymes and D. E. Bittle (eds.) *Studies in Southwestern Linguistics*. The Hague: Mouton.

CASSELL, J. [ed.] (1987) *Children in the Field: Anthropological Experiences*. Philadelphia: Temple Univ. Press.

COHEN, R. and R. NAROLL (1970) "Method in cultural anthropology," pp. 3-24 in R. Naroll and R. Cohen (eds.) *Handbook of Method in Cultural Anthropology*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.

CRAPANZANO, V. (1970) "The writing of ethnography." *Dialectical Anthropology* 2: 69-73.

CRAPANZANO, V. (1980) *Tuhami: Portrait of a Moroccan*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

CRAPANZANO, V. (1985) *Waiting: The Whites of South Africa*. New York: Random House.

DAVIS, F. (1963) *Passage through Crisis*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.

DIAMOND, S. [ed.] (1980) *Anthropology, Ancestors and Heirs*. The Hague: Mouton.

DOUGLAS, J. D. (1976) *Investigative Social Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

DOUGLAS, J. D. and J. M. JOHNSON [eds.] (1977) *Existential Sociology*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.

DUMONT, J. - P. (1978) *The Headman and I: Ambiguity and Ambivalence in the Fieldwork Experience*. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press.

ELLEN, R. F. [ed.] (1984) "Introduction," pp. 1-12 in *Ethnographic Research*. New York: Academic Press.

EMERSON, R. M. [ed.] (1983) "Introduction," pp. 1-35 *Contemporary Field Research*. Boston: Little, Brown.

EMERSON, R. M. (1984) "From the new editor." *Urban Life* 13: 3-6.

EVERHART, R. B. (1977) "Between stranger and friend: some consequences of 'long-term' fieldwork in schools." *Amer. Educ. Research J.* 14: 1-15.

FIELDING, N. G. and J. L. FIELDING (1986) *Linking Data*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

FILSTEAD, W. J. [ed.] (1970) *Qualitative Methodology*. Chicago: Markham.

FRAKE, C. O. (1964) "Notes on queries in ethnography." *Amer. Anthropologist* 66: 132-145.

FREILICH, M. [ed.] (1970) "Toward a formalization of field work," pp. 485-585 in *Marginal Natives*. New York: Harper & Row.

FUJISAKA, S. J. and J. GRAZEL (1978) "Partnership research: a case of divergent ethnographic styles in prison fieldwork." *Human Organization* 37: 173-179.

GARFINKEL, H. (1967) *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

GEERTZ, C. (1973) *The Interpretation of Culture*. New York: Basic Books.

GOFFMAN, E. (1959) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday.

GOLD, R. L. (1958) "Roles in sociological field observation." *Social Forces* 36: 217-223.

GOODENOUGH, W. (1956) "Componential analysis and the study of meaning." *Language* 32: 195-216.

GOODENOUGH, W. (1964) "Cultural anthropology and linguistics," in D. Hymes (ed.) *Language and Culture in Society*. New York: Harper & Row.

GUSFIELD, J. (1963) *Symbolic Crusade*. Urbana, IL: Univ. of Illinois Press.

HABENSTEIN, R. (1954) "The American funeral director." Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.

HABENSTEIN, R. (1970) *Pathways to Data*. Chicago: Aldine.

HAMMERSLEY, M. and P. ATKINSON (1983) *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*. New York: Tavistock.

HARRIS, M. (1968) *The Rise of Anthropological Theory*. New York: Crowell.

HOMANS, G. C. (1986) "Fifty years of sociology." *Annual Rev. of Sociology* 12: xxii-xxx.

IRWIN, J. (1975) "Editors' report." *Urban Life* 4: 3-4.

JARVIE, I. C. (1969) "The problem of ethical integrity in participant observation." *Current Anthropology* 10: 505-508.

JOHNSON, J. M. (1975) *Doing Field Research*. New York: Free Press.

JULES-ROSETTE, B. (1975) *African Apostles*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press.

JUNKER, B. (1960) *Field Work: An Introduction to the Social Sciences*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

KEATING, P. [ed.] (1976) *Into Unknown England, 1866-1913*. Manchester, England: Manchester Univ. Press.

KEEN, F. (1985) "Definitions of kin." *J. of Anthropological Research* 41: 62-90.

KIRK, J. and M. L. MILLER (1986) *Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

LOFLAND, J. and L. LOFLAND (1984) *Analyzing Social Settings*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

LOUNSBURY, F. G. (1956) "A semantic analysis of the Pawnee kinship usage." *Language* 32: 158-184.

MANES, J. I. (1976) *Semantic Relations in American English Folk Definitions*. Ann Arbor, MI: Univ. Microfilm.

MANNING, P. K. (1978) "Editor's remarks." *Urban Life* 7: 283-284.

MANNING, P. K. (1982) "Qualitative methods," pp. 1-28 in R. B. Smith and P. K. Manning (eds.) *A Handbook of Social Science Methods*, vol. 2: Qualitative Methods. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

MC CALL, G. J. and J. L. SIMMONS [eds.] (1969) *Issues in Participant Observation*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

MEHAN, H. and H. WOOD (1975) *The Reality of Ethnomethodology*. New York: John Wiley.

METZGER, D. and G. E. WILLIAMS (1966) "Some procedures and results in the study of native categories: Tzeltal firewood." *Amer. Anthropologist* 68: 389-407.

MILLER, S. M. (1952) "The participant observer and 'over-rapport'." *Amer. Soc. Rev.* 17: 97-99.

NAROLL, R. (1962) *Data Quality Control*. New York: Free Press.

NAROLL, R. (1970) "Data quality control in cross-cultural surveys," pp. 927-945 in R. Naroll and R. Cohen (eds.) *A Handbook of Method in Cultural Anthropology*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.

PELTO, P. and G. PELTO (1973) *Anthropological Research: The Structure of Inquiry*. London: Cambridge Univ. Press.

PLATT, J. (1981) "Whatever happened to the case study? or from Znaniecki to Lazarsfeld in one generation." Unpublished manuscript, University of Sussex.

PLATT, J. (1983) "The development of the 'participant observation' method in sociology: origin, myth and history." *J. of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 19: 379-393.

POWDERMAKER, H. (1966) *Stranger and Friend. The Way of an Anthropologist*. New York: Norton.

PUNCH, M. (1986) *The Politics and Ethics of Fieldwork*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

RABINOW, P. (1977) *Reflection of Fieldwork in Morocco*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

ROHNER, R. (1966) "Franz Boas: ethnographer of the Northwest," In J. Helm (ed.) *Pioneers of American Anthropology*. Seattle: Univ. of Washington Press.

ROSALDO, M. Z. (1980) *Knowledge and Passion*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

ROTH, J. (1963) *Timetables*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merril.

SCHOLTE, B. (1980) "Anthropological traditions: their definitions," in S. Diamond (ed.) *Anthropology: Ancestors and Heirs*. The Hague: Mouton.

SCHWARTZ, H. and J. JACOBS (1979) *Qualitative Sociology*. New York: Free Press.

SCHWARTZ, M. S. and C. G. SCHWARTZ (1955) "Problems in participant observation." *Amer. J. of Sociology* 60: 343-353.

SHAFFIR, W., R. STEBBINS, and A. TUROWETZ [eds.] (1980) *Fieldwork Experience*. New York: St. Martin's.

SILVERMAN, D. (1985) *Qualitative Methodology and Sociology*. Brookfield, VT: Gower.

SPECTOR, M. and R. FAULKNER (1980) "Thoughts on five new journals and some old ones." *Comtemporary Sociology* 9: 477-482.

SPRADLEY, J. P. (1979) *The Ethnographic Interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

SPRADLEY, J. P. (1980) *Participant Observation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

TURNER, V. (1985) *On the Edge of the Bush: Anthropology as Experience*. Tucson: Univ. of Arizona Press.

VAN MAANEN, J. (1983) *Varieties of Qualitative Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

VAN MAANEN, J. (1984) "Before the flood." *Urban Life* 13: 99-102.

VIDICH, A. (1955) "Participant observation and the collection and interpretation of data." *Amer. J. of Sociology* 60: 354-360.

WARNER, W. L. and P. S. LUNT (1941) *The Social Life of a Modern Community*. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press.

WARNER, W. L. and P. S. LUNT (1942) *The Status System of a Modern Community*. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press.

WAX, M. L. (1972) "Tenting with Malinowski." *Amer. Soc. Review* 37: 1-13.

WAX, R. (1971) *Doing Fieldwork*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

WEBB, E. J. (1966) *Unobtrusive Measures*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

WERNER, O. (1966) "Pragmatics and ethnoscience." *Anthro. Linguistics* 8: 42-65.

WERNER, O. (1983) "Microcomputers in cultural anthropology." *Byte* 7: 250-280.

WERNER, O. and G. M. SCHOEPPLE (1986a) *Systematic Fieldwork: Foundations of Ethnography and Interviewing*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

WERNER, O. (1986b) *Systematic Fieldwork: Ethnographic Analysis and Data Management*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

PATRICIA A. ADLER is Assistant Professor of Sociology at Washington University, St. Louis. In addition to editing *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*,

she edits (with Peter Adler) *Sociological Studies of Child Development*. Her main areas of interest are qualitative methods, contemporary social theory, deviance, and work and occupations.

**PETER ADLER** is Associate Professor of Sociology at Washington University, St. Louis. He is working on a new monograph, *The Engulfed Self*, which is drawn from his four-year participant-observation study of college athletes. His main areas of interest are work and leisure, deviant behavior, marriage and the family, and qualitative methodology.